

Second Report of Business Advisory Committee.

Presentation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I present the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That the Assembly agrees with the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Assembly agrees with the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee.”

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಸಿರಾ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರುವ Business Advisory Committee ಯ ಎರಡನೆಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಎರೋಧ ಮಾಡಬೇಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಈಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ಅವಸರದ ಮದುವೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುವುದು, ಒಂದೊಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಗಂಟೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಇದು ಸರ್ವಧಾ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆಗ ತಾನೇ ಮದುವೆಯಾದ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಗಳನ್ನು ಗಂಡನ ಮನೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವಾಗ ತಂದೆಯು ಮಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ರೊಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿ ಅಳಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವಂತಿದೆ ಇದು. ನಾವು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂರು ಸಾರಿ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕರೆದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಯೋಗ್ಯತಾನುಸಾರ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಎಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There should not be a long speech. Please mention your point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋದರೆ, ಯಾವ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದಬ್ಬಳವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಚುಚ್ಚಿದರೂ ಇವರು ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆನೆಗೆ ಅಂಕುಶದಿಂದ ಚುಚ್ಚಿದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದರ ಗುಳವನ್ನು ಕಾಯಿಸಿ ಬರೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೂ ಇವರೇನೂ ಬದಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಯೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುವುದು, ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು. ನಮಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನ ಗೌರವಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸದೆ ಅವರನ್ನೂ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆದು ಇಂಥ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Agricultural Income tax, Sales tax ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿಂದ ಬರುವ ಆದಾಯ ಮುಂತಾದವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗಂಟೆಗಳು ಸಾಕೆ? ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ ವೇತ್ತರಾದ ನೀವೇ ಹೇಳಿ. ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆದು

ಈ ಮೂರು ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೇವಲ 60 ನಿಮಿಷ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ವಧಾ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪಿದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಒಂದೆರಡು ದಿವಸ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI (Chief Minister).—I rise to a point of order. I refer to rule 228.

“At any time after the report has been presented to the Assembly, a motion may be moved that the Assembly agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report :

“Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter :

“Provided further that not more than half-an-hour shall be allotted for the discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion”

There should be a motion. The Honourable Member Sri Muckannappa is an old member ; he must be knowing about it. He has made no motion ; he is speaking on the report. He cannot do it unless he makes a motion that the report be sent back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It was the practice in this House. Even when the Chief Minister was the Speaker, he allowed members to express their views.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It was never the practice. I am aware that no such practice was subsisting in this House. I am aware that a motion will have to be made by an Hon'ble Member to refer the report back to the Committee on particular matters or something like that.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is it not my duty to apprise the Chair and the House as to why it should be sent back to the Committee ? He has forgotten what he has done as Speaker.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I have not forgotten anything. I am reading the rule itself. The rule is very clear that a motion will have to be made. If the Hon'ble Member wants, he can make a motion in particular terms.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Within the five-year period when he was the Speaker, there used to be no motion or anything of the sort. He used to place the report before the House and ask if there was any objection. Any member aggrieved used to say that the time not sufficient and that more time must be allotted and so on.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Please don't misinterpret. There was no such procedure that you are now talking about. I am sure there used to be a motion and on that motion some sort of a discussion took place.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised. Do you want to say anything on the point of order?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I leave it to the sweet will of the Chair.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—May I know the rule to which the Chief Minister just now referred?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule No. 228, page 61.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, the Report is before the House and the rule says that the Assembly agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report. These are the words quoted in this rule. So far as the last alternative is concerned—"disagrees with the report"—the Hon'ble Member wants to say something to request the other Members of the House to disagree with the Report that is already before the House for approval. So, no point of order is involved in this case.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palya).—I would invite the attention of the Chair to the proviso: "provided further that not more than half-an-hour shall be allotted for the discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Muckannappa has exceeded the time-limit of five minutes and whatever be his right he has exceeded the time-limit.

In regard to the interpretation, I feel that the Hon'ble Chief Minister is right because the rule says:

"At any time after the report has been presented to the Assembly"

It was done by me and the Leader of the Opposition made a motion that the Assembly agrees with it.

The next point is a motion may be moved that the Assembly agrees with amendments" Nobody has given notice of such a motion.

The third point is "or disagrees with the report". Such a motion is not before the House. Therefore, there is no point in saying that the Chief Minister is wrong in contending that there is no motion to that effect. If there is such a motion, there is a time limit also. Therefore, you have only to support. It has reached a stage that the Business Advisory Committee of the House has gone into the matter and submitted a report and it has done some work. After that, the only motion is to agree to it. There is no other motion. Sri C. J. Muckannappa should have moved an amendment that this House disagrees with the report. I can understand what has been disclosed and made known to the House and not what is happening in the Hon'ble Member's mind. I uphold the point of order raised by the Chief Minister. So, I put the question moved by the Leader of the Opposition that the House agrees with the Report placed before it.

The question is:

"That the Assembly agrees with the Report."

The motion was adopted.

Suspension of a Member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before the other work of the House is taken, it is my duty to refer to an incident that happened on the 3rd April 1962.

Hon'ble Members will remember that on the 3rd April 1962 which was the last day of the last series of sittings a very serious and unhappy incident took place in this House.